



nukegate.org 
@Nukegate

Promote



More physics crap from Hans Bethe debunked, this time by Dr Tom Ramos on his design calculations for Teller's nuclear bomb powered X-Ray laser, Excalibur: "Anyway, with Bethe coming in, it turned out he was claiming some of the cross sections we were using for atomic interactions were wrong. Specifically, there was one cross section he claimed was off by an order of magnitude. If you accepted his calculation, the X-ray lasing would fail. Peter came into my office and said, "Tom, we have an issue. Bethe's coming in, and I need you to run your code and show this and that." So I did. I did the calculations and we were able to demonstrate to Bethe that his calculations were wrong. Our basis for establishing a population inversion to get the gains in lasers that we were claiming to get were actually quite accurate and true. To his credit, Bethe admitted it and said, "I agree with what you have." So, I played a small role in countermanding a Hans Bethe calculation, which to this day I'm still astounded thinking about. So yes, the JASONs were coming in. Detractors like Hans Bethe were coming in." - aip.org/history-progra...

It was Bethe also who deleted the blast energy absorption theory of Von Neumann in v7 of the secret report LA-1021 "Blast Wave" when editing the crap openly-published summary LA-2000 "Blast Wave". It was Bethe also who falsely claimed high altitude bursts produce negligible EMP because he ignored the key mechanisms, and it was Bethe who caused the Castle-Bravo fallout disaster by falsely claiming that 14.1 Mev fusion neutrons would be slowed down below the lithium-7 fission threshold before hitting lithium-7 in the fuel, despite Teller's earlier calculations to the contrary - see nukegate.com for debunking of Bethe's far left wing propaganda fake "physics" BS. Pathetic!!

"With the X-ray laser, Chapline argued, you could put a whole bunch of lasers around one bomb, with the bomb pumping each of the lasers, and you could point each laser at a separate target. With the X-ray laser, one interceptor could destroy ten or one hundred Soviet missiles. The economic argument was reversed- it was cheaper to defend than to attack. That became the basic argument about the X-ray laser, the political argument. As I mentioned, we did achieve a workable laser, but by the time we achieved it, the Cold War was ending. If everything had worked perfectly, we might have seen a significant advantage to defending ourselves. One hiccup though: you had to have adequate warning because you had to hit these targets in outer space. I remember sitting with a couple of guys and we did some calculations about how much time was needed to get an X-ray laser up into outer space to shoot at a Soviet warhead. And I remember joking, "Hell, we'd have to have satellites over the Soviet Union. If you saw a Russian soldier double-timing towards a missile silo, you'd have to launch immediately. You'd have to react that quickly." Then we thought, "What about a submarine launched ballistic missile? That doesn't have to go halfway around the world, it could be launched off the coast. You're talking thirty seconds, not fifteen minutes anymore. You'd have less than a minute to react. There's no defense against that. ... the heresy part comes in when you're not talking about a foe like the Soviet Union, but a foe like North Korea. If we're dealing with an irrational power, and they build some sort of missile, ISIS gets their hands on it for instance, then the logic behind deterrence, it seems to me, changes. Classic deterrence may not be appropriate with that form of threat. Nevertheless, it would be nice to defend ourselves against an irrational Kim Jong-un or an Ayatollah. Whether a missile threat from an irrational state would require an X-ray laser, or perhaps a conventional interceptor like THAAD would work is a reasonable question to ask. A North Korea, Iran, or some other country like that, is not going to have the overwhelming power that the Soviet



Search

Relevant people



nukegate.org 
@Nukegate

[nukegate.org vixra.org/abs/1408.0151](https://nukegate.org/vixra.org/abs/1408.0151)
vixra.org/abs/1111.0111
vixra.org/abs/1305.0012
quantumfieldtheory.org





Union would've had. You actually might be able to effectively intercept a missile attack. In that case, defensive research is very appropriate, to me, it makes perfect sense. ... Again, it is essential to have a fundamental, credible deterrent to stop some idiot like Putin from doing something awful just because he thinks he can get away with it. And I'm not feeling very comfortable with Xi Jinping in China, either. He's doing stuff we might consider irrational. This argument is an important topic in my book because the same argument was going on in the fifties. Bill Kauffman and others like him looked at the arms race and commented, "This doesn't make any sense." Curtis LeMay wanted to build thousands more bombs and thousands more bombers. It was analysts at RAND, especially Bill Kauffman, Herman Kahn, and Albert Wohlstetter, who were very prominent in this. They argued it was the quality of a deterrent force that is most important, not the quantity. Our strategy shouldn't be to match the Soviets missile for missile, bomb for bomb. We need something that's fundamentally credible, and then we can negotiate like hell. And I truly believe that. ... We have a rising China. We have a Russia with this guy Putin running it, and he's bragging about his tactical nuclear weapons. What if he uses a tactical nuclear weapon on Lithuania?" - aip.org/history-progra...

Last edited 11:28 AM · Sep 25, 2024 · 3 Views

View post engagements



Post your reply

Reply



Post



Explore

Beta

TikTok Blocks Russian State Media Accounts



Trending now · SocialMedia

Trump Pledges to End US Support for Ukraine



Trending now · Politics

Lukashenko Orders Belarusian Military to Prepare for War



22 hours ago · Politics

Show more

Terms of Service Privacy Policy Cookie Policy Accessibility Ads info More ... © 2024 X Corp.

